

**REMARKS**

**I.           Status Of The Claims**

Claims 1-6, 8-37, and 39-62 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10, 15, 32-35, 37, 39, 41, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman (U.S. Patent No. 6,400,810) in view of Bain (U.S. Patent No. 6,288,715).

Claims 5 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Bain and Kaars (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0059384).

Claims 9 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman and Bain in view of Reed (U.S. Patent No. 5,862,325).

Claims 11 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman and Bain in view of Dillon (U.S. Patent No. 6,067,561).

Claims 12 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman and Bain in view of Reed.

Claims 13, 14, 44, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman and Bain in view of McKinley (U.S. Patent No. 4,926,326).

Claims 16 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman and Bain in view of Wong (U.S. Patent No. 5,542,115).

Claims 17, 18, 20, 22, 24, 29, 30, 48, 49, 51, 53, 55, 60, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Bain and Lagimonier (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0041265).

Claims 19 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Bain, Lagimonier, and Kaars.

Claims 21 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Bain, Lagimonier, and Reed.

Claims 23 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Bain, Lagimonier, and Reed.

Claims 25 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Bain, Lagimonier, and Dillon.

Claims 26 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Bain, Lagimonier, and Reed.

Claims 27, 28, 58, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Bain, Lagimonier, and McKinley.

Claims 31 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Bain, Lagimonier, and Wong.

Claims 1, 17, 32, and 48 are independent.

With this response claims 17, 29, 48, and 60 are amended. No new matter has been added.

## **II. Rejection of Independent Claims 1, 17, 32, and 48**

The Office Action rejects independent claims 1 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman and Bain, and rejects independent claims 17 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman, Bain, and Lagimonier.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that the references, taken individually or in combination, fail, for example, to disclose, teach, or suggest:

“... displaying a screensaver;  
capturing a visual state of said displaying ...; [and]

displaying the captured visual state to the user ...”

as set forth in each of claims 1 and 32 (emphasis added), and

“... displaying to said user ... wherein ... displaying [is]  
performed while a user interface of said node is displaying a  
screensaver;  
capturing a visual state of displaying, wherein portions  
of the captured visual state correspond to one or more of said  
messages to which said notifications correspond; and  
displaying the captured visual state to the user”

as set forth in each of claims 17 and 48 as amended herewith (emphasis added).

The Office Action apparently contends that such is disclosed among col. 1 ln. 59 -  
col. 2 ln. 12 of Bain. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants respectfully submit that this portion of Bain merely indicates that:

“[i]ncluded in the memory is a screensaver communications  
program. Part of the screensaver program is a display  
graphic for a dialogue box which may be displayed on a  
computer screen after a predetermined period of inactivity  
for the computer. The dialogue box may include designated  
areas for typing in information such as a title for the  
message, a name of a person leaving the message, as well as  
the message itself”  
(see Bain col. 1 ln. 59-66).

There is no disclosure, teaching, or suggestion in Bain, for instance, that the  
“dialog box” is a captured visual state of displaying a screensaver.

Should the Office Action be arguing that Bain discloses the above-identified of  
claims 1, 17, 32, and 48 via discussion that:

“[o]nce in the operational mode, and after a predetermined  
period of activity for the computer, the dialogue box will  
appear on the screen. In one aspect of the invention, the  
dialogue box will periodically move to different positions on  
the screen as is typical for a screensaver program”  
(See Bain col. 2 ln. 28-32),

Applicants believe it clear that such also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, for example, that the

“dialog box” is a captured visual state of displaying a screensaver.

In view of at least the forgoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 17, 32, and 48, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

**III. Dependent Claim Rejections**

Applicants do not believe it is necessary at this time to further address the rejections of the dependent claims as Applicants believe that the foregoing places the independent claims in condition for allowance. Applicants, however, reserve the right to further address those rejections in the future should such a response be deemed necessary and appropriate.

*(Continued on next page)*

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that this Application is in condition for allowance for which action is earnestly solicited.

If a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution of this Application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 0900-0010. **A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.**


Furthermore, in the event that a further extension of time is required, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the above-noted Deposit Account and Order No.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: April 21, 2006

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Angus R. Gill  
Registration No. 51,133

**Mailing Address:**  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, New York 10281-2101  
(212) 415-8700  
(212) 415-8701 (Fax)